

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:23-cv-2193 Date: August 2, 2024

Title Kamath v. Judith Ashmann Gerst, et al.

Present: The Honorable Stephanie S. Christensen, U.S. Magistrate Judge

Teagan Snyder
Deputy Clerk

n/a
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendants:
None Present

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS)

The Court is in receipt of Plaintiff's July 30, 2024, letter to the Court. (ECF 30.) Plaintiff's letter appears to be a request to further extend the opposition deadline so that she may supplement the opposition to the motion to dismiss that she filed on July 25, 2024 (ECF 28). So construed, Plaintiff's request is DENIED.

The request includes no cause in support thereof. Further, Plaintiff was provided ample opportunity to file her opposition. On May 1, 2024, Defendants filed the motion to dismiss the first amended complaint. (ECF 18.) The Court set a deadline of May 24, 2024, for Plaintiff to file any opposition to the motion to dismiss. (ECF 19.) On May 24, 2024, Plaintiff filed a request for extension of time until July 3, 2024, to file her opposition. (ECF 20.) Over Defendants' objection, the Court granted Plaintiff's extension request and accepted her proposed date which allowed Plaintiff more than a month to file her opposition. (ECF 22.) The Court cautioned Plaintiff that "[n]o further extensions of time to file th[e] opposition w[ould] be granted." (*Id.*) On July 4, 2024,

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:23-cv-2193 Date: August 2, 2024

Title Kamath v. Judith Ashmann Gerst, et al.

a day after the opposition deadline, Plaintiff filed a second extension request seeking until July 12, 2024, to file her opposition. (ECF 23.) The reason for the extension request was deadlines she faced in other legal cases. The Court denied the request and ordered Plaintiff to show cause by July 25, 2024, why Defendants' motion to dismiss should not be granted and/or the action dismissed for Plaintiff's failure to prosecute or comply with Court orders. (ECF 24.) The Court ordered that in the alternative, Plaintiff could file an opposition to the motion to dismiss by July 25, 2024, automatically discharging the order to show cause. (*Id.*) As the order was filed on July 15, 2024, Plaintiff effectively had an additional ten days from that date to file her opposition, and a total of nearly three months from the May 1, 2024, motion filing.

Plaintiff filed an opposition on July 25, 2024. (ECF 28.) Any attempt to supplement the opposition at this late date is untimely. The motion to dismiss was filed three months ago and Plaintiff's continued extension requests are obstructing the adjudication of this matter and the Court's ability to manage its docket. Accordingly, the Court will not set aside or adjust the current briefing schedule. Defendants' reply to Plaintiff's opposition shall remain due on August 16, 2024, and the Court will take the matter under submission after that date.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

:

ts
